

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 1 has been amended, and claims 1, 2, 8, and 19 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1, 2, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by Jeong (KR 2002-0074550). In particular, the Examiner asserts that Jeong teaches a secondary battery comprising electrode tabs 520 that extend through a sealing surface 300 of a case 100, which are bent only once, at a substantially right angle.

In order to even more particularly point out the aspects of the present invention, claim 1 has been amended, so as to recite that the electrode tabs extend from the positive and negative electrode plates, through the case, are then bent only once, and form a substantially right angle with respect to a plane of the sealing surface.

Contrary to the assertions of the Examiner, element 300 is not a sealing surface of the case 100, but rather, is a cross-linkable resin 300 that is used to seal a sealing surface 122 of the case 100 (pg. 5, para. 4). In other words, the resin 300 is an element that is distinct from the case 100. In addition, Jeong fails to explicitly teach that ends of the electrode tabs 520 are bent.

However, as is shown in FIG. 4, the electrode tabs 520 appear to be bent more than once from the sealing surface 122 of the case 200. In particular, the electrode tabs 520 appear to be bent twice, i.e., once when they emerge from the case 100, and then once again at an edge of the case 100, so as to be parallel to the sealing surface 122.

Furthermore, Jeong recites that the alleged protection circuit board 400 is actually taught to be a protection circuit case 400. Thus, Jeong fails to teach or disclose the presently recited protection circuit board. Therefore, Jeong fails to teach or disclose all aspects of the electrode tabs recited in these claims.

Therefore, this rejection has been respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Jeong (KR 2002-0074550) and further in AAPA. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the AAPA remedies the deficits of Jeong, by teaching electrode tapes.

For at least the reasons recited above, the AAPA fails to remedy the deficits of Jeong. Therefore, this rejection has been respectfully traversed.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN MCEWEN, LLP

Date: 10/6/09

By: 
Matthew T. Gill
Registration No. 48,490

1400 Eye St., N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510